

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa et al. (US 6,063,527) and in view of Xia et al. ("Soft Lithography." Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 1998, pp. 550-575) and in further view of Song et al. (US 2001/0019382).

### **Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended claims 1, 11 and 16 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending for further consideration.

### **All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishikawa, Xia and Song. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method of forming a color filter layer including, in part, "... forming a second sub-color filter on the substrate ..., the first sub-color filter used as one sidewall of the second channel and the second mold used as the other sidewall of the second channel while injecting the second color resin, wherein injecting the second color resin into the second channel is performed after placing the second mold on the substrate; and forming a third sub-color filter on the substrate ..., the second sub-color filter used as one

sidewall of the third channel and the third mold used as the other sidewall of the third channel while injecting the third color resin, wherein injecting the third color resin into the third channel is performed after placing the third mold on the substrate ....” The cited references do not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-10, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 11, as amended, recites a method of forming a color filter layer including, in part, “... filling the second channel with a second color resin to form a second sub-color filter after attaching the second mold on the substrate, the first sub-color filter used as one sidewall of the second channel and the second mold used as the other sidewall of the second channel while filling the second channel with the second color resin; ... filling the third channel with a third color resin to form a third sub-color filter after attaching the third mold on the substrate, the second sub-color filter used as one sidewall of the third channel and the third mold used as the other sidewall of the third channel while filling the third channel with the third color resin, ....” The cited references do not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 and claims 12-15, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 16, as amended, recites a method of fabricating a color filter substrate for a liquid crystal display device including, in part, “... filling the second channel with a second color resin to form a second sub-color filter after attaching the second mold on the substrate, the first sub-color filter used as one sidewall of the second channel and the second mold used as the

other sidewall of the third channel while filling the second channel with the second color resin; ... filling the third channel with a third color resin to form a third sub-color filter after attaching the third mold on the substrate, the second sub-color filter used as one sidewall of the third channel and the third mold used as the other sidewall of the third channel while filling the third channel with the third color resin; ....” The cited references do not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 and claims 17-20, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-20 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: /Xiaobin You/  
Xiaobin You  
Reg. No. 62,510

Date: March 16, 2010

**Customer No. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: 202.739.3000  
Fax: 202.739.3001